

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

DENNIS ROSS, et al., *Individually and on behalf
of All Others Similarly Situated*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CREDIT ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 22-2632-KSM

ORDER

AND NOW this 10th day of August, 2022, upon consideration of Plaintiffs' Motion to Stay Proceedings Pending Determination of Plaintiffs' Motion for Remand, and If Necessary, Request for a 14-Day Extension to File Response (Doc. No. 21), it is **ORDERED** that the Motion is **DENIED**. Plaintiffs shall respond to Defendants' Motion to Compel Individual Arbitration (Doc. No. 18) by **AUGUST 15, 2022**.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Karen Spencer Marston

KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.

¹ Plaintiffs' counsel informed the Court at the August 1 preliminary pretrial conference that he would respond to the Motion to Compel by August 9. On August 4, in a letter to the Court, he reiterated that Plaintiffs would "respond to the pending Motion to Compel Arbitration (ECF 12) by next Tuesday, August 9." (Doc. No. 18 at p. 1.) Indeed, under this Court's Local Rules, the response was due August 9. *See* E.D. Pa. Local R. 7.1(c) ("Unless the Court directs otherwise, any party opposing the motion shall serve a brief in opposition together with such answer or other response that may be appropriate, within fourteen (14) days after service of the motion and supporting brief. In the absence of timely response, the motion may be granted as uncontested . . ."). Despite his assurances and Rule 7.1, Plaintiffs failed to file a response, and instead, at 11:54 p.m. on August 9, filed the current motion to stay or, in the alternative, for a 14-day extension. Although the Court has agreed to extend the response deadline by a few days, we warn Plaintiffs' counsel that this conduct will not be tolerated in the future. As a matter of professionalism, extension requests must be submitted *before* the pending deadline.